

REMARKS

Claims 1-10, 12-29, 31-48, and 50-52 are pending in the present application. In the Office Action, claims 1, 11-13, 15-16, 21, 30, 32-35, 38-41, 44-46, and 51-52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by the subject matter described on page 45 of the Hadfield publication, referred to hereinafter as Hadfield. Applicants note that the Examiner has only provided page 45 of Hadfield. Claims 17-18, 31, 37, and 50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hadfield in view of Official Notice. Claims 19-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hadfield in view of Heald. Claims 24 and 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hadfield in view of Vogt. Claims 23 and 42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hadfield in view of Anderson. Claims 2, 14, 22, and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hadfield in view of Aaro (U.S. Patent No. 6,662,020). Claims 3-10, 25-29, 36, and 47-48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hadfield in view of Angelo (U.S. Patent No. 6,581,162). The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 21, 34, 39, and 40 set forth a plurality of operating modes including a secure operating mode and one or more secured assets coupled to a processor that may operate in one of the operating modes. Claims 1, 21, 34, 39, and 40 also set forth controlling access to the secured assets dependent upon the operating mode of the processor. Access to the secure assets in the secure operating mode may include providing access to a mailbox RAM configured to store input and output data. The mailbox RAM includes an inbox for storing input data for the one or more secured assets and an outbox for storing output data from the one or more secured assets. For example, one embodiment of mailbox RAM 415 includes two banks of RAM, such as 512

bytes each, for passing parameters into and out of the secure execution box 260. Parameters passed to or from the sub-devices included within the security hardware 370 are exchanged at the mailbox RAM 415. One bank of RAM 415, an inbox, is write-only to most of all of the computer system in most operating modes. Thus, parameters to be passed to the sub-devices included within the security hardware 370 may be written into the inbox. During selected operating modes, such as SMM, both read and write accesses are allowed to the inbox. Another bank of RAM 415, an outbox, is read-only to most of all of the computer system in most operating modes. Thus, parameters to be received from the sub-devices included within the security hardware 370 may be read from the outbox. During selected operating modes, preferably secure modes, such as SMM, both read and write accesses are allowed to the outbox.

See Patent Application, page 20, line 17 – page, 21, line 3 and Figure 5A.

Applicants note that “an anticipating reference by definition must disclose every limitation of the rejected claim in the same relationship to one another as set forth in the claim.” *In re Bond*, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566, 1567 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Applicants respectfully submit that Hadfield fails to disclose every limitation of the rejected claim in the same relationship to one another as set forth in the pending claims.

Hadfield describes a Windows NT server that provides user accounts. To access a user account, a user must be validated by the system by providing a valid name and password. However, Hadfield does not describe or suggest a plurality of operating modes including a secure operating mode. Hadfield also fails to teach or suggest one or more secured assets coupled to a processor that may operate in one of the operating modes. The Examiner alleges that “files” may be secure assets. However, the Examiner provides no record support for this conclusory statement and Hadfield does not teach or suggest that “files” may be secure assets.

Hadfield also fails to teach or suggest a mailbox RAM that includes an inbox for storing input data for the one or more secured assets and an outbox for storing output data from the one or more secured assets.

For at least the aforementioned reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the present invention is not anticipated by Hadfield and request that the Examiner's rejections of claims 1, 11-13, 15-16, 21, 30, 32-35, 38-41, 44-46, and 51-52 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) be withdrawn.

Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that the pending claims are not obvious in view of Hadfield, Heald, Vogt, Anderson, Aaro, or Angelo either alone or in combination. As discussed above, Hadfield fails to teach or suggest many limitations of the various embodiments of the inventions set forth in claims 1-10, 12-29, 31-48, and 50-52. With regard to the secondary references, the Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well-known to provide a predetermined response in lieu of data. Heald describes a battery to provide reserve power, Anderson describes a random number generator, Vogt describes a monotonic counter, and Aaro describes a memory for storing data directly coupled to a display. Angelo describes a method for securely managing encryption information in a computer system that uses a secure mode of operation and a normal mode of operation.

However, the secondary references all fail to remedy the fundamental deficiencies of Hadfield. In particular, the secondary references fail to teach or suggest a plurality of operating modes including a secure operating mode. The secondary references also fail to teach or suggest one or more secured assets coupled to a processor that may operate in one of the operating modes. The secondary references also fail to teach or suggest a mailbox RAM that includes an inbox for storing input data for the one or more secured assets and an outbox for storing output data from the one or more secured assets.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the present invention is not obvious over any combination of Hadfield, Heald, Anderson, Vogt, Aaro, or Angelo. Applicants request that the Examiner's rejections of claims 2-10, 14, 17-20, 22-29, 31, 36-37, 42-43, and 50 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be withdrawn.

For the aforementioned reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all claims pending in the present application are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (713) 934-4052 with any questions, comments or suggestions relating to the referenced patent application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 7/25/05



Mark W. Sincell, Ph.D.
Reg. No. 52,226
Williams Morgan & Amerson, P.C.
10333 Richmond Avenue, Suite 1100
Houston, TX 77042
(713) 934-7000
(713) 934-7011 (Fax)

AGENT FOR APPLICANTS